

### **REMARKS**

This Response is intended as a complete response to the Office Action dated July 18, 2006. In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that all claims are presently in condition for allowance.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS**

#### **35 USC §112**

Claim 39, and claim 40 depending therefrom, stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner notes that the term "the photoresist" in claim 39 lacks antecedent basis.

In response, the Applicants have amended claim 39 to delete the term "the photoresist" from the claim.

Thus, the Applicants submit that claims 39 and 40 satisfy the requirements of 35 USC §112 and are patentable thereunder. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his comments regarding the allowability of claims 1, 3-38, and 41-42. The Applicants further thank the Examiner for his comments regarding the allowability of claims 39 and 40 if amended to overcome the 35 USC §112 rejection. In view of the present amendment of claim 39, discussed above, the Applicants believe that all claims are now in allowable form.

### **CONCLUSION**

Thus, the Applicants submit that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issuance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Alan Taboada at (732) 935-7100 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

October 17, 2006

Date

/Alan Taboada/

Alan Taboada, Attorney

Reg. No. 51,359

(732) 935-7100

Moser IP Law Group

1040 Broad St.

Shrewsbury, NJ 07702